Neighbors:

Please do the following to help speak up against the overreaching, unnecessary and severe water restrictions placed on Solana Beach residents for no good reason:

Facts:

- There is NO water shortage in our Region per the San Diego County Water Authority!!! This is a fact!!
- We have 50% more water than the restrictions warrant
- · We have spent billions of taxes / water bonds to ensure reliable water
- o Colorado water rights
- o Imperial County water rights
- o Lined the aquaduct
- o New reservoirs and dams
- o Opened the largest De-Sal plant in the US that will provide another 10% of our water needs!! It can provide more with easy expansion.
- o We only get 8% of our water from Northern CA o Yet the Gov and State Water Board continue to place extreme, overreaching and unnecessary water restrictions on our community.
- One size set of restrictions does not fit all!
- We can't pump water up hill!
- · Whatever water we save here does NOT help Nor CA one bit!
- · We are lumped win with Rancho Santa Fe. Our condos and smaller SFR and lots do not use as much water as RSF.
- It's not fair or possible to continue to cut back 32-35% and live like a 3rd world country
- o Flushing every other time, buckets in all the showers and sinks, dead lawns
- Now SB City Council is enacting Ordinance #467 with even greater restrictions including no new lawns unless you install a \$15,000 water meter!!!
- We are NOT AZ! We are NOT Northern CA!!
- o Northern CA flushes 1.3 Trillion gallons of water out to the ocean every year to save 13 +/- smelt!!!
- o Environmental extremists there have screwed their water supply no delta water, no del-sal plants they only rely on snow and rain o Hoping for snow and rain is NOT Change and not good policy.
- o Because they refuse to use technology to fix their water problem, they prefer to punish us all!!
- · We have the technology so let's use it and stop this madness cause solely by politicians (one actually) and bureaucrats!
- Enough is enough!!
- · Many of us (400 +/-) residents are also adjacent to Purple pipe water now used to water our banks. Let's get access to it and safe another 40% of potable water use if that is the actual motive!

Requested Action for you:

- Please review the email trail and letters below
- · Please send your comments (or reiterate the above facts) to the SWB Kathy Frevert at Kathy.Frevert@waterboards.ca.gov at this email link today!! Deadline is Wed 1/6
- · Please attend the SB City council on Wed 1/13 at 6PM to join me and others and voice your concern and request: (WEAR A BLUE SHIRT!!)

- o Want SB Council to represent the residents of SB and fight the overreaching, excessive, severe and unnecessary restrictions!
- o Let the Gov and SWB know we will no longer support or comply with their severe restrictions
- o 'Reasonable conservation' of say 8% (the amount we pull from Northern CA) might make sense as 'showing our support for Nor Cal's drought.
- o Rescind Ordinance #467
- o Save 40% +/- of our potable water use by pushing for expediting and stream lining access to and reducing 'regulations' for using the existing purple pipe system
- · Please cc to Catherine Dickerson @ cedickerson1@roadrunner.com and visit her website @ http://www.watersandiego.org
- · Spread the word:
- o If you are a real estate agent in this area, let all the other agents (and your client / homeowner list) in your SB farm area know about this and ask for participation and support (It's a great way to contact homeowners w/o soliciting!) o Forward to your HOAs and HOA board members to get the word out to their association members o Forward to your neighborhood watch list o Forward to your neighbors and encourage their attendance o Print this email and place in mail boxes in the area

Purposed Action for the Council:

- · We need our City Council to stand up for us residents against the Gov, the SD County Water Board (SDCWB), State Water Board (SWB) and Santa Fe Irrigation District (SFID) NOT cow-tow or make even more restrictions or ordinances!
- o Letters, phone calls, emails, petitions to Gov, Legislators, County officials, state and local water districts
- · We need them to state we will NOT comply with the current or proposed "revised restrictions". We have plenty of water
- o We will consider reasonable 8-10% restriction (if any)
- · We need them to support the law suits of other cities, counties (Riverside which has their own aquifer)
- · We need them to help expedite, streamline and reduce regulations for access and use of existing purple infrastructure in our area
- · We need them to get "full credit" for our del-sal and purple pipe recycling!
- o The SWB staff is 100% against such recommendations!! Nonesense!

Thank you in advance for your support!!

Dave Ferguson
GOLDMAN FERGUSON PARTNERS LLC

PH: 619.787.6280 FAX: 858.755.2601

dave@goldmanferguson.com

[&]quot;Land of the Free, Because of the Brave!"

From: "Towart, John" < john.towart@siemens.com>

Date: January 4, 2016 at 12:14:39 PM PST

To: "islaverdeboard@gmail.com" <islaverdeboard@gmail.com>

Subject: Solana Beach Proposed Regulatory Framework

Dear Neighbors,

I am forwarding the letter below regarding council activities and the subsequent water regulations. The letter is from a Solana Beach resident, Catherine Dickerson, that is very passionate about water discipline vs. regulation. The SB City Council Proposed Regulatory Framework is added at the end of the letter. Please keep in mind that the request for input is by January 6th and that there will be meetings at City Hall in the next two weeks.

I apologize for the amount of information here, but it is a very important subject. I looked for detail regarding Ordinance #467, but it is not yet listed with the city municipal code.

Dear Neighbor,

In the face of the now indisputable fact that due to decades of planning and developing technology, San Diego has no shortage of water supply (in fact, we currently have almost 50% more water than we're allowed to use), the Governor and the State Water Board are insisting that restrictions continue. They are considering a possible mitigation of no more than 4%. For many Solana Beach residents, that would be an overall 32% reduction in use under 2013 amounts, rather than a 36% reduction. If you think that is an unjust restriction for San Diego, I invite you to let them know:

"The State Water Board is interested in receiving feedback on this proposed regulatory framework. Please submit comments with the subject line: "Comments on Proposed Regulatory Framework" by email to: Kathy Frevert at Kathy.Frevert@waterboards.ca.gov by January 6, 2016."

Ever eager to dictate our lifestyles and keep up with Governor Brown's edicts, on December 11 the Solana Beach City Council voted in Ordinance #467, further restricting our landscaping and gardening choices. In an email exchange, Council member Lesa Heebner informed me that the Council was voting in our best interests. I have further been told that the only voices the Council hears at meetings are those of environmentalists who are fighting against development of any water sources, and for much more draconian restrictions.

If you are a Solana Beach resident and agree that our politicians should be protecting our interests based on facts, not political agenda, I invite you let them know. Please join me and other residents at the next Solana Beach City Council Meeting on Wednesday, January 13, at City Hall. Time is set aside at 6:00 p.m. for brief public comments. You can leave immediately thereafter.

Your yard is beautiful. I hope you'll join me and other neighbors in speaking/writing in defense of our rights to continue to enjoy our choices.

Sincerely,

Catherine Dickerson, Solana Beach

www.watersandiego.org (for more information about San Diego's water supply, technology and politics)

Proposed Regulatory Framework for Extended Emergency Regulation for Urban Water Conservation

The State Water Board, December 21, 2015

Drought Resilient Sources of Supply Credit:

Stakeholder Proposal: Suppliers would receive a credit for desalinated seawater or indirect potable reuse (IPR) water. The credit would come in the form of a one-to-one reduction from the calculated amount of water that needs to be saved under the Emergency Regulation. A supplier could deduct all water derived from desalination or IPR from their total savings requirement. San Diego County Water Authority proposes a similar credit for Colorado River water received through long-term transfers of conserved water.

Staff Recommendation: Provide a one-tier (four percentage point) reduction to the conservation standard of urban water suppliers using new drought resilient water supplies. The credit would apply to urban water suppliers that certify, and provide documentation upon request, that at least 4 percent of its potable supply is comprised of indirect potable reuse of coastal wastewater (the creation and use of which does not injure another legal user of water or the environment) or desalinated seawater developed since 2013. [Editor's note: The Carlsbad desalination plant alone will provide 10% of San Diego's potable water supply.] Staff does not recommend extending this credit to Colorado River water received through long-term transfer of conserved water.

Non-potable Recycled Water Use Credit:

Stakeholder Proposal: This proposal would apply to suppliers that meet a large portion of irrigation demand with non-potable recycled water. These suppliers would be able to reduce their 2016 monthly potable water production by the ratio of non-potable recycled water use to total potable water production multiplied by their total water production and their conservation. Reducing 2016 total potable water production would have the effect of reducing the required volume of water saved.

Staff Recommendation: Staff does not recommend providing additional credit for non-potable recycled water use.

Groundwater Credits:

Stakeholder Proposal: This set of proposals would provide credit for "sustainable" groundwater management and groundwater augmentation. Suppliers would provide verification that the groundwater supply is formally certified to meet certain eligibility requirements and then would be eligible to deduct certain groundwater use from their total potable production. In effect, the use of eligible groundwater would be counted the same as conserved water. There are four proposed credit scenarios: 1) Groundwater Banking; (2) Conjunctive Use; (3) "Sustainable" Groundwater Management; and (4) Adjudicated Basins. The proposals include requirements that would govern the use of the credits under each scenario.

Staff Recommendation: Staff does not recommend providing credits for groundwater use or management since the effect of such credits are not well-defined and are generally inconsistent with goal of conserving the state's remaining surface and groundwater supplies during the drought.

Regional Compliance Approach:

Stakeholder Proposal: This proposal would allow suppliers to jointly comply with their aggregated conservation standards as a single entity. Regions would be allowed to form, on a voluntary basis, based on the criteria for forming a SBx7-7 regional alliance, per Water Code Section 10608.28. A lead agency for the region would report the Regional Conservation Standard monthly to the State Water Board on behalf of the region. Each urban retail water supplier would also continue to report their individual monthly water use data. If a group as whole did not meet its regional conservation target, the suppliers would revert back to their individual requirements.

Staff Recommendation: Staff does not recommend providing an option for regional compliance because it will impede timely compliance and enforcement action by the Board and has the potential to reduce individual water supplier accountability.

Next Steps:

- · Comments are due on this proposed regulatory framework by January 6, 2016
- · A draft Emergency Regulation will be released for public comment in mid-January 2016
- State Water Board consideration of an extended emergency regulation is anticipated in early February 2016.

The State Water Board is interested in receiving feedback on this proposed regulatory framework. Please submit comments with the subject line: "Comments on Proposed Regulatory Framework" by email to: Kathy Frevert at Kathy.Frevert@waterboards.ca.gov by January 6, 2016.

If you have comments or opinions, please send your emails to Kathy Frevert or attend the Council Meeting on January 13. If you want more information regarding the water supply, etc. please go to www.watersandiego.org

Regards,

John Towart
President, Isla Verde Association, Inc.

Mobile :+1 (858) 663-6580 islaverdeboard@gmail.com

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message and any attachments are intended solely for the individual or individuals designated above. It may contain confidential or proprietary information and may be subject other confidentiality protections. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized to

read, copy, retain or distribute this message. If you receive this message in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message. The sender does not waive any privilege or right of privacy or confidentiality that may attach to this communication.

To: Kathy.Frevert@waterboards.ca.gov

Ms. Felicia Marcus and Ms. Kathy Frevert,

The website of the State Water Control Board says "Protecting California's Water." But in fact, your "conservation" policies are dangerous threats to our water supply.

No amount of conservation is going to increase our supply of water. That can only be achieved with science and technology. When you prohibit the purchase of available water, you destroy the incentive and opportunity for bright scientists, engineers and entrepreneurs to put their intelligence and efforts into creating an abundant and affordable supply.

The knowledge and ability are abundantly available, the supply is abundantly available (starting with 840 miles of coastline along the Pacific Ocean . . .). Yet in the face of plain facts, you are working to destroy our quality of life by destroying precious resources.

As you must know by now, thanks to long term planning and investment in cutting edge technology, San Diego County has had no water shortage during the now-ending 4-year drought, and in fact currently has almost 50% more water than we're allowed to use under your current restrictions.

Instead of your draconian restrictions, you should be heralding San Diego as an example to the rest of the state. Water agencies in the the county of San Diego have taken, and continue to take, numerous steps to develop a reliable water supply for its rate payers, including but not limited to:

- Imperial Irrigation District water transfer, beginning in 2003
- Lining of All American and Coachella canals completed 2010
- Carlsbad desalination plant, completed 2015
- Padre Dam recycled water project
- San Diego recycled water project--projected to supply 1/3 of county water needs;

Water agencies in the county of San Diego have taken, and continue to take, steps to expand our emergency water storage, including but not limited to:

- Oivenhain Dam and Reservoir, completed 2003
- San Vicente Dam raised, more than doubling capacity of San Vicente reservoir, in 2015

San Diegans have invested heavily in these projects over the past 20+ years. You have no right to prohibit us from purchasing the water we have paid to have developed.

In our climate with cycles of drought, we need technology to develop a weather-proof water supply. We need the freedom and protection of property rights that make science, technology and entrepreneurship possible. We need freedom from oppressive regulations so that bright, hard working people can put their knowledge and skills to work.

WE DO NOT need bureaucrats and politicians to force your personal agendas on us, dictating how long to shower, how often to flush our toilets, what plants to grow, and other offensive interventions into our private lives.

WE DO NOT need bureaucrats and politicians to send us back to the pioneer days of carrying water buckets and living in dirt. This is the the 21st century, with the science and technology to create an abundance of human values, from beautiful, disease resistant plants, to the internet, to life-saving medical discoveries, to landing a piano-sized probe on a comet after traveling 10 years through space!!!

Most of all, WE DO NOT need bureaucrats and politicians violating our property rights. Your job is to protect our freedoms and our rights, so that we are free to use our own minds to make our own decisions and pursue our own values, not blindly follow your personal dictates.

You have no justification, factual or moral, to impose emergency water restrictions on San Diego. The only honest action is to remove them all completely, and immediately.

Sincerely,

Catherine Dickerson
http://www.watersandiego.org
technology, not deprivation
Greetings,

I've been asked for a sample letter, for those in a rush to get something out to the Water Board before next Wednesday. Multiple copies of the same letter don't pack much punch, but here is an outline that might be of help. I've also attached some recently published letters to the editor to give you some more ideas.

- 1. State your purpose: e.g., to oppose the unfair/over-reaching/rights violating—your description—imposition of emergency water restrictions on San Diego County.
- 2. Set the context with some facts—here are a few (see articles on the website www.watersandiego for more):

San Diego County has had no water shortage during the current 4-year drought, and in fact currently has almost 50% more water than we're allowed to use under current restrictions—without El Nino;

Water boards in the the county of San Diego have taken, and continue to take, numerous steps to develop a reliable water supply for its rate payers, including but not limited to:

- Imperial Irrigation District water transfer, beginning in 2003
- Lining of All American and Coachella canals completed 2010
- Carlsbad desalination plant, completed 2015
- Recycled water projects
- Padre Dam recycled water project:

- San Diego recycled water project (projected to supply 1/3 of county water needs by 2035);

Water boards in the county of San Diego have taken, and continue to take, steps to expand our emergency water storage, including but not limited to:

- Oivenhain Dam and Reservoir, completed 2003
- San Vicente Dam raised, more than doubling capacity of San Vicente reservoir, in 2015

San Diegans have invested heavily over the past 20 years to pay for these water projects.

The state mandated restrictions are actually serious threats to our water supply. No amount of conservation will increase our supply during cycles of drought, only technology can do that. Prohibiting us from buying the water from sources that have been developed over the last 2 decades

removes any incentive for bright scientists, engineers and entrepreneurs to bring their minds and hard work to bear on making our water supply reliable and affordable, independent of weather.

These restrictions are violations of our property rights and our freedom. We have paid to have this water developed, and have the right to purchase and use it, each according to our own individual choices.

3. Make an action request/demand: e.g. remove the emergency restrictions on water use here in San Diego, where there is no water emergency.

Thank you for taking the time to express your thoughts and to make your voice heard in defense of the truth, our property rights and our freedom!

Sincerely,

Catherine Dickerson
http://www.watersandiego.org
technology, not deprivation

P.S. For those of you who are residents of Solana Beach and can't attend the City Council meeting on 1/13, but would like to express your thoughts to the Council about Ordinance #167 further limiting our landscaping choices, here are the email addresses of the council members:

David Zito - Mayor dzito@cosb.org (858) 720-4491

Peter Zahn - Deputy Mayor pzahn@cosb.org (858) 720-4495

Mike Nichols - Councilmember

mnichols@cosb.org (858) 720-2498

Ginger Marshall - Councilmember gmarshall@cosb.org (858) 720-2492

Lesa Heebner - Councilmember lesaheebnercouncil@me.com (858) 720-2490

Sent from my iPhone